THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

Minutes - The University Senate
Friday, May 8, 1970
Faculty Conference Room, sixth floor of the Library

Minute 1 In the absence of President Elliott and Vice President Bright, the Chairman of the Executive Committee opened the meeting at 2:10 p.m. Professor Stevens asked that the new members of the Senate be introduced and welcomed, and this was done.

Minute 2 Professor Morgan asked that the word "minimum" (** Probable Minimum Cost - $1,000's) instead of "maximum" be used in his tabulation attached to the minutes of the April 10, 1970, meeting. With this change the minutes were approved as presented.

Minute 3a The Chair introduced Vice President Herzog who in turn introduced Mr. Arthur H. Fawcett, Jr., who presented a report on the plans for developing the University over the next few decades. Condensed into outline form the campus plan encompassed the following:

Current Policy — To stabilize student body at 15,000 plus or minus 2,000;
use of highest density permissible;
central location for University Library, classrooms, research offices, and peripheral location for the Administration Building, dormitories, activities building, parking garages; grouping medical complex around the Hospital.

Objectives — An educational environment compatible with surrounding community;
effective functioning (separation of pedestrian from automobile circulation with recommended raised open space);
beautification (preservation of certain historical buildings, mostly churches);
special character (unified open space plan);
provision for continuing growth (research institutes, etc.)

Phasing I — Immediate Needs (within five years)
Medical School, Basic Science Building
University Library
New Parking Garage
Faculty Office Building

II — For 17,000 Maximum (within second five years)
Completion of Medical Complex
Activities Building (including athletic facilities)
Fine Arts Center
Administration Building Expansion
Law School Building Expansion
Additional Classroom Buildings
Additional Parking Garages
New Office Buildings for Rental/University Use

III Future Development -
Additional buildings for expansion of activities such as patient care, academic and research needs, and other University services.

Minute 3b Professor Stevens announced the dates for the 1970-71 session of the Senate: the second Friday of October, November, December, February, March and May; the third Friday in January (because of the Christmas Recess), and the third Friday in April (because of the Spring Recess). Specifically the dates are as follows:

October 9, 1970
November 13, 1970
December 11, 1970
January 15, 1971
February 12, 1971
March 12, 1971
April 16, 1971
May 14, 1971

Minute 3c Professor Morgan moved, and Professor Wood seconded, that the nominations and elections of committee chairmanships and memberships be postponed to a special meeting at 2:10 p.m., May 22, 1970. After discussion and debate the motion carried.

Minute 4 Professor Cottrell presented a resumé of his Addendum to the Annual Report of the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty. The addendum is attached. Professor Robinson moved that the matter, as recommended by Professor Cottrell's committee, be referred to next year's committee for further study and report by December 1, 1970. Professor Morgan seconded. After discussion and debate the motion carried.

Minute 5a Professor Robinson moved, and Professor Highfill seconded, the adoption of Resolution 69/20, then moved to amend the resolution by changing the words "for one semester" to "to November 15, 1970," and that the matter be placed on the agenda of the October meeting of the Senate. The Chair ruled out of order that part of the amendment which called for placing the matter on the agenda for the October meeting of the Senate. Professor Robinson, Professor Griffith seconding, appealed the decision of the Chair. By a vote of 14 to 7 the decision of the Chair was sustained. After discussion and debate the question was called and the amendment was defeated. Professor Robinson, Professor Kirsch seconding, moved the addition to the resolution of the following (from Page 6, Paragraph 6, of Professor Park's special committee report of April 29, 1970): "The University Senate, in extending the present system, asks the President of the University to immediately assign to an administrator the explicit duties of investigating, preparing and assuring the full presentation of the University's case in student disciplinary procedures." After discussion the amendment carried unanimously.

Professor Wood, Professor Kirsch seconding, moved the addition to the resolution of the following (from Page 6, Paragraphs 8 and 9, of Professor Park's special committee report of April 29, 1970): "The University Senate shall empower the President of the University to appoint a special committee of himself or the Provost, the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and a student named by the President

"whenever the backlog of pending cases before the student court reasonably so requires, and that such special committee further be empowered to appoint as many Ad Hoc Trial Committees as are needed to expeditiously process the pending cases; further, that each Ad Hoc Trial Committee be bound by the same procedures as the student court, be composed of four students and three faculty, and be chaired by one of the faculty members." After debate and discussion the amendment passed unanimously.

The question was called and the resolution as amended passed unanimously.

Minute 5b Professor Griffith, Professor Morgan seconding, moved that Resolution 69/21 be postponed for consideration at a special Senate meeting on May 22, 1970. The question was called and the motion carried.

Minute 6a Annual Reports were presented from the following Committees:

Admissions and Advanced Standing
Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
Educational Policy
Faculty Performance and Development
Physical Facilities
Research
Resources
Scholarship
University and Urban Affairs
Executive Committee

Minute 6b Professor Kirsch asked if it would be possible to reconsider the adoption of Resolution 69/13. The Chair ruled that anyone who had voted in favor of the resolution could offer a motion to reconsider. Professor Griffith moved to reconsider Resolution 69/13. There was no second to the motion and the Chair ruled that the motion failed for want of a second.

Minute 7a A report of the Subcommittee on Modified Semester was introduced by Miss Gail Rosenthal and Mr. James Swartz. The report was referred to the Educational Policy Committee.

Minute 7b Senate members and students participated in an extended discussion as to the course the University should pursue in view of the events in Washington and the Nation. Professor Sharkey, seconded by Professor LeBlanc, moved that the Executive Committee of the Senate be empowered to consider events of the next few days and to call a special Senate meeting to reconsider the question of final examinations if the situation warranted. After discussion of the motion, Professor LeBlanc, seconded by Professor Sharkey, moved the following substitute amendment: The Senate has confidence that the President will call the Faculty Senate to reconsider the examination period if the situation warrants. After considerable discussion Professor Shane, seconded by Professor Kirsch, moved to table the

motion and the substitution and the motion to table carried.

Minute 8 After further discussion of the crisis at the University, Professor Kirsch, Professor Reesing seconding, moved to adjourn. By a vote of 10 to 8 the motion carried and Professor Stevens declared the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Frederick R Houser

Frederick R. Houser
Secretary

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

University Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty

Addendum to Annual Report, 1969-1970

The Annual Report, dated 2 April 1970, and the Interim special report re Resolution 69/10 of the same date, and attached to the 10 April 1970 University Senate meeting minutes, are incorporated with this addendum to the former to represent the total report of the Committee for 1969-1970.

In addition to the two special meetings already reported, three further special meetings were held (on 15 and 29 April and 6 May) in conducting the investigation of procedures of registration and ancillary problems (69/10) referred to the Committee. Two questionnaires were formulated, distributed, received, tabulated and analyzed. The Committee drafted a report based on the foregoing experiences, invited those who had previously met with Committee to react to the draft, and submit this addendum to complete the record of the Committee's endeavors. It is anticipated that the Committee will continue to study this matter in 1970-1971.

I. General Impressions of "Registration"

A. "Registration" is a very broad term, which may include (in normal sequence):

1. Determination of courses to be offered, including instructors, number of sections, schedule (semester, days of week, and time of day), and room assignments--i.e., COURSE SCHEDULING

2. STUDENT ADVISING, including approval and pre-sectioning

3. DEPARTMENT approval and SECTIONING for each course

4. DEAN'S OFFICE APPROVAL

5. FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT.

COURSE SCHEDULING is the primary responsibility of the faculty, by departments, assisted by the administration and influenced by a variety of inputs. It is often times necessary to plan at least one year (or more) ahead in order to determine faculty needs, submit budgets, and publish catalogs and class schedules. (Often errors made at this stage do not become apparent until course sectioning begins.) Adjustments are not always possible and information about schedule changes is sometimes unavailable or delayed.

STUDENT ADVISING may or may not be accomplished during the "Registration" period immediately preceding each new semester. When any form of pre-"registration" or pre-sectioning is used, it may be a month or more removed from the semester involved, and a greater number of modifications (e.g., drop-adds) are inevitable.

SECTIONING, DEAN'S APPROVAL and FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT are presently all included in the designated "registration" period at the beginning of each new semester.

At least in part because of the similarity between the terms "registration" and "registrar," it is easy to assume that the registrar is administratively responsible for all facets of "registration." Such is not the case currently at The George Washington University.

B. The heterogeneity of The George Washington University student population:

1. Approximately 13,600 students registered during the Spring 1970 semester in courses taught on-campus.

2. Approximately 12,400 students "registered" during the three-day (Thursday 29 January through Saturday, 31 January 1970) general "registration," averaging approximately 3-4 courses/students to total about 43,400 student course enrollments. (The latter figures are projections based on the sample of student questionnaires available.)

3. Less than 60% are full-time students.

4. Over half are either undergraduate or non-degree students; the balance are either graduate students or working toward their first professional degree.

5. Less than 500 are involved in the separate "registration" of medical students, who are all full-time.

6. The ratios between full- and part-time students and graduate versus undergraduate students vary greatly among the ten schools, colleges, and divisions within the University.

7. Similarly, the approximately 40 departments involved in the general "registration" are very differently affected by the foregoing.

8. Twenty-four departments have one or more courses having course or laboratory fees. In many cases, where more than one course from a single department has such a fee, there is some variation in the amount of the fee within departments, as well as between departments.

9. An irregularly increasing proportion of students make "special arrangements," including third-party payment, in completing their financial settlement with the University each semester.

C. Some changes, usually minor, are made prior to almost every "registration," based in part on an analysis of the preceding one. Those administrative officials having some responsibility for the mechanics meet after each "registration" to assess the process and begin planning for the next, including discussion of possible changes.

D. There is a sub-committee of this Committee organized and authorized by the Senate in January 1969. The sub-committee includes student, faculty, and administration representatives. However, the sub-committee has not met during the current academic year.

E. Although the University has attempted to use alphabetical, by student's last name, means of control to distribute the numbers of students eligible to "register" on any particular day, enforcement varies greatly. Faculty, deans, and administration all seem to share in this variability. Some departments fail to reserve half of their course enrollments for the second day of registration.

F. Unofficial (or at least unannounced) reserving of spaces by instructors or departments occurs in some courses, in order to provide for departmental majors and expected blocks of students from other programs.

II. 1969-1970 Observations

A. Partly due to pre-registration, the Fall 1969 "registration" seems to have proceeded relatively smoothly, except for some overcrowding in the gym.

B. In the Spring 1970 registration, the tub files (containing IBM class cards for each course and each section in the quantity specified by the department) in the gym were combined with those in the Hall of Government. Lengthy lines often occurred at this point in the process.

C. Lengthy lines occurred at the FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT phase in the Hall of Government.

D. The weather was inclement.

E. This "registration" followed the first semester under the new calendar. The shortened semester appears to reduce opportunities for student advising and increase vacation periods.

F. There was a decrease in numbers of dormitory resident advisors, who often help encourage students to see their faculty advisors more regularly and especially preceding the regular "registration" period.

G. Some departments were late in submitting class schedules for the spring semester, delaying the publication of the Schedule of Classes.

III. Student Questionnaire

Two hundred seventy-nine questionnaires were mailed to a 2% sample of all students currently enrolled, selected by taking every fiftieth name from the master file. This file is kept by student number. In addition, an article in the 13 April issue of The Hatchet invited any other interested students to obtain, in either Building C or the University Center, and complete the same questionnaire. Only 6 completed questionnaires were received in response to this announcement.

Of the 279 questionnaires mailed to local addresses, only 120 were accounted for in any manner. Seven were returned as undeliverable. One was returned blank with a brief explanation. One hundred thirteen contained usable information. This is less than one per cent of currently enrolled students. This factor must be remembered in interpreting or weighing the responses. There were more than ten responses from only three schools or colleges.

The first five items requested information describing the student's status and college or division. The next five asked for information concerning their Spring 1970 "registration" experiences, including load, sectioning, time required, and getting signature(s). The last four items requested reactions to alphabetical "registration," issuing IBM class cards by departments rather than centrally, paying tuition and regular fees only at "registration" and being billed for other fees, and views toward "preregistration." Finally, students were asked about their willingness to meet with one or more members of the Committee, upon request, to explore their responses in more detail.

The brief analysis which follows is based on the 113 usable sample questionnaires, omitting five from the School of Medicine which has a separate "registration," plus the six additional volunteer questionnaires. Thus, there are 114 potential responses to each item, a sample of about 0.8% of the current student enrollment.

In response to questions about enrolling in courses with more than one section, approximately 65 per cent of George Washington students take one or more courses with multiple sections. Over 25 per cent of this group report they encountered closed courses. The corresponding figure for Columbian College only was higher, approximately 25 per cent of students reporting closed courses. Approximately 17 per cent of the total sample encountered closed sections while 'registering.'

Question #8 surveyed when students "registered," how long it took, and the point(s) at which most time was consumed. Responses indicated considerable time was spent by various students in accomplishing all four elements outlined in I.A. (2, 3, 4, and 5). In decreasing order, students report delays in FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT, obtaining IBM class cards, STUDENT ADVISING, DEPARTMENT SECTIONING, AND DEAN'S APPROVAL. The first two were frequently identified as very time-consuming. Some students identified more than one time-consuming point.

The next question dealt with the availability of the faculty advisor as scheduled. About 10 per cent of students responding to this item reported some delay or lack of advisor's availability. A similar question about the availability of approval as scheduled from the Dean's office revealed a "No" answer from approximately 5% of the students reporting.

The number of students responding to the four reaction items was considerably reduced because of an apparent error in phrasing the instructions. The term on-campus was used, the intent being to refer to the location of the classes students were attending. It appears that many interpreted it in reference to whether they were housed or resided on-campus. Over half of the students did respond to these reaction items.

By about a 2 to 1 ratio the students favored continuance of "registration" alphabetically if the same system were to be continued. They wanted it enforced throughout the process, however, and others suggested breaking the alphabetical segments more finely than half, and setting smaller time periods during the normal period (e.g., A-C from Noon to 2 PM; D-F from 2 to 4 PM; etc.). Those who suggested an alternative most often recommended "registering" by year in school or by student number.

Students point out, by more than a 6 to 1 ratio, more advantages than disadvantages in having IBM class cards issued by departments rather than centrally. However, when asked about the pro's and con's of full-time students paying only regular tuition and fees based directly on tuition at "registration" and being billed for other applicable fees due after registration, approximately equal numbers of students agreed, disagreed, or found some balance among the pro and con points concerning this idea.

Those responding felt strongly (about 6 to 1) that "preregistration" should be expanded, rather than remaining "as is," with no student recommendation for reducing it.

IV. Faculty Questionnaire

Forty faculty "registration" questionnaires were sent to department chairmen or those serving in a similar capacity. Twenty-three had been returned as of 1 May 1970. Two more were received by 8 May. In addition, about twenty copies were sent to other faculty. This included those members of the University Senate not included among the department chairman group and three or four sent out in response to requests after a notice announcing its availability to interested faculty was included in the 20 April 1970 issue of the Monday Report. Ten usable returns were received from faculty other than department chairmen.

In responding about factors in addition to past experience affecting COURSE SCHEDULING, instructor preferences, communications (or other inputs) from students, and communications from other departments in the same school or college were all identified by over 50 per cent of the respondents as factors which were important and used. The latter two factors were identified by an additional one-third of the respondents as "Important, but information not generally available."

Communications from the Registrar, communications from departments of other schools and colleges, and advisory committee (school or college) recommendations were factors of decreasing importance.

Three department chairmen reported that not all courses which require permission of the instructor for admission are so indicated in the catalog. All but one reported that all course requisites in the catalog were checked before department approval to take a course is given. The majority of the faculty feel "preregistration" should be expanded rather than reduced or remain as is. Similarly, the majority of the faculty reporting feel that alphabetical scheduling should be continued.

A number of faculty indicated their lack of understanding directly by their comment or perhaps indirectly by skipping the item (#7) pertaining to issuing IBM class cards by departments rather than centrally. However, others felt there were definite advantages and disadvantages. Better control by departments were a common theme of the advantages listed. Similarly, there were proportionately fewer faculty than student responses to the item (#10) pertaining to payment of tuition and certain regular fees.

Lastly, the faculty appeared almost evenly divided in their opinions concerning sufficient coordination of registration. Those who thought there was sufficient coordination slightly outnumbered those who thought not.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Advisors, departments, and deans are responsible for enforcement of registration schedules.

2. Issuance of IBM class cards should be done by departments on a trial basis, with subsequent evaluation to determine its relative permanency.

3. Improved utilization or elimination of the 3 x 5 "departmental information card" should be explored by department chairmen.

4. Steps should be taken to make fuller use of the concept of pre-registration.

5. Greater use of pre-sectioning, as now employed by some departments, should be considered by all other departments.

6. The University Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty should continue to study "registration," including the role of its present sub-committee. Their recommendations should be offered for implementation through the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Committee wishes to extend its thanks to Mr. Frederick Houser, Registrar; Mr. Frederick Naramore, Comptroller; Mr. Maurice Heartfield, Assistant Treasurer; their staffs; Associate Dean George Koehl of Columbian College; and the students and faculty who completed questionnaires for their assistance in this study.

The chairman wishes to further acknowledge the assistance of Miss Ellison Royce in typing the questionnaires, cover letters, and reports, and assisting in many ways to carry out this study. The Registrar's office assumed costs of preparing the student sample mailing list and the reproduction and folding of the questionnaires and cover letters.

Some of the Committee were unable to participate in this study and therefore are not included below.

Raymond S. Cottrell, Chairman

The Committee Participants
Gayle Clapp
Raymond S. Cottrell
Robert E. Cronin
Frederick H. Gibbs
Carol R. St. Cyr
William D. Johnson, ex officio

8 May 1970

Minority Report Appended

The chairman felt it appropriate to suggest a procedure in elaboration of Recommendation #4. Although time did not permit a thorough discussion with the Committee, the procedure suggested incorporates a number of recommendations and is as follows (it differs from the pre-registration procedures now employed during the late Spring for the following Fall, and would be applicable both semesters):

"'Pre-registration,' at least through sectioning, should be expanded, on a trial basis. Approximately the last month of each regular semester could be employed. At the time the Schedule of Classes is released, the IBM class card files could be made available to the departments and 'registration' could proceed up to financial settlement. This last step could be accomplished by mail, through billing. Perhaps the present 'registration' period could be reduced since only new students would 'register' at this time, and it might well be done on a first come - first serve basis."

The foregoing suggested procedure is a direct outcome of the total investigation of Resolution 69/10, including analyses of both questionnaires which was a primary responsibility of the chairman alone.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond S. Cottrell, Chairman

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

University Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty

"Registration" Questionnaire

Instructions: Please complete all information requested. Circle answers unless otherwise requested. If you need additional room or wish to make comments concerning any or all of the items, please attach necessary paper, identifying the addition by the appropriate item number. Please return via campus mail to Professor R. S. Cottrell, Building C-524, on or before 17 April 1970.

1-4. Student status: (circle four) Female Male Undergraduate Graduate Full-time Part-time On-campus Off-campus

5. College or division: (circle one) Columbian College Div. of Univ. Stud. Med. SEAS Law SPIA Educ. GSAS SGBA CGS

6. Course load in semester hours (Spring 1970) _____

7A. Number of courses in which currently enrolled _____

7B. Of those, how many have more than one section (#) _____
Did you encounter any difficulty getting into the desired section?

NO (#)_____; YES (#) _____. If "yes," give one line explanation for each, identifying course by department and number:

_____ _____

_____ _____

7C. Did you encounter any "closed" courses? NO YES If "yes," give one line explanation for each, identifying course by department and number and indicating whether required or elective.

_____ _____

_____ _____

8. When did you register?
A. DATE: Th, 29 Jan. F, 30 Jan. S, 31 Jan. Other_____
If "other," answer 8C and then go on to item 9

B. TIME started:_____

C. TIME to completion (to nearest hour):_____

D. At what point was most time consumed?_____

E. How much time (to nearest half-hour) was spent at this step?_____

9. Was your faculty advisor available as scheduled? YES NO

If "no," identify department and comment. _____ _____

10. Were signatures for Dean's office approval available as scheduled?

YES NO If "no," comment. _____

REACTION ITEMS (for on-campus students other than medical students only):

11. Should alphabetical scheduling be continued? YES NO

If "yes," at what point(s) should it be enforced? _____

If "no," please suggest an alternate procedure, if possible. _____

12. What advantages and disadvantages would arise from having IBM class cards issued by departments, rather than centrally as the last step prior to financial settlement?

Advantages: _____

Disadvantages: _____

13. What do you see as the pro's and con's of having fulltime students pay only regular tuition and fees based directly on tuition at time of registration and being billed for other applicable fees due after registration?

Pro's _____

Con's _____

14. Should "preregistration" be expanded, reduced, or remain as is? _____

Would you be willing to meet with one or more members of the Committee, at their request? NO YES If "yes," list phone number(s) at which you can be reached or receive a message: _____

NAME _____ STUDENT NO. _____

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

University Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty

Faculty "Registration" Questionnaire

Instructions: Please complete all information requested. Circle answers unless otherwise requested. If you need additional room or wish to make comments concerning any or all of the items, please attach necessary paper, identifying the addition by the appropriate item number. Please return via campus mail to Professor R. S. Cottrell, Building C, Room 524, on or before 24 April 1970.

1. College or Division: (circle one) Columbian College | Div. of Univ. Stud. | Med. | SEAS | Law | SPIA | Educ. | GSAS | SGBA | CGS

2. Department: _____

"REGISTRATION" is a very broad term which appears to include all of the following elements:

A. Determination of courses to be offered, including instructors, number of sections, and schedule (semester, days of week, and time of day)
B. Student advising
C. Departmental approval and sectioning for each course
D. Approval by Dean's office
E. Financial settlement

3. What, in your opinion, are the important elements which may have been omitted from the above analysis? _____

4. Assuming that past experience is the most commonly used basis for planning what courses to offer when, what other factors does your department employ in "A"? (Circle X, Y or Z; X = Important and used; Y = Important, but information not generally available; Z = Unimportant.)

a. Instructor preferences X Y Z
b. Communications from other departments in the same school or college X Y Z
c. Communications from departments of other schools or colleges X Y Z
d. Communications from the Registrar X Y Z
e. Communications (or other inputs) from students X Y Z
f. Advisory committee (school or college) recommendations X Y Z

Comments on any of the above: _____

5. Are all courses which require permission of the instructor for admission so indicated in the catalog? YES NO

6. Are all requisites listed in the catalog checked before departmental approval ("C") is given? YES NO If "yes," by whom? FACULTY SECRETARY

7. What advantages and disadvantages would arise from having IBM class cards ("C") issued by departments, rather than centrally as the last step prior to financial settlement?

Advantages: _____

Disadvantages: _____

8. Should "preregistration" be expanded, reduced, or remain as is? _____

9. Should alphabetical scheduling be continued? YES NO

If "yes," at what point(s) should it be enforced? _____

If "no," please suggest an alternate procedure, if possible. _____

10. What do you see as the pro's and con's of having full-time students pay only regular tuition and fees based directly on tuition at time of registration and being billed for other applicable fees due after registration?

Pro's _____

Con's _____

11. Is there sufficient coordination of "registration"? YES NO If "no," who should have the responsibility for providing the necessary coordination?

12. What kinds of information do you now lack which would facilitate "A" and "C"?

Would you be willing to meet with one or more members of the Committee, at their request? NO YES If "yes," list phone number(s) at which you can be reached or receive a message: _____

NAME _____

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND ADVANCED STANDING

Annual Report 1969-70

Two meetings of the Committee were held during the 1969-70 session for purposes of general discussion.

There were no referrals to the Committee for report during this session, and there are no resolutions recommended for the agenda of the 1970-71 Committee.

Robert N. Ganz

Robert N. Ganz, Chairman

The Committee
L. F. Affronti
Dorothy M. Betz
Barbara Dunham
Robert N. Ganz
Marvin Gordon
Roy C. Lindholm
Muriel McClanahan
Frederick L. Minn
Margaret W. Montzka
Blake S. Root
Lois Schwoerer
Frederick R. Houser, ex officio
Marianne Phelps, ex officio
Joseph Y. Ruth, ex officio

May 8, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT, SALARY, AND PROMOTION POLICIES (INCLUDING FRINGE BENEFITS)

Annual Report 1969-70

The committee met eight times during the academic year and directed its attention to the following three matters: (1) University progress towards reaching the A average AAUP salary level by the specified goal of 1970-71; (2) the continued appropriateness of the provisions of the "Code and Ordinances Governing the Academic Personnel of The George Washington University"; and (3) the desirability of altering the tuition waiver benefit for faculty children to provide an alternative of assistance at other institutions.

(1) 1970-71 budget figures supplied the committee by Director of the Budget Johnson indicated that the commitment to reach the AAUP A-scale average compensation will have been reached. Coincident with the University's reaching its goal, the AAUP has revised its method of comparing salary levels, abandoning the letter-grade scale for a more realistic decile system distinguishing among institutions of different types. While the system was not yet sufficiently refined to allow the committee to determine precisely where we stand, preliminary figures suggest that our 1970-71 compensation levels will place us among "Universities and Technical Institutions" as follows: Professors--3d decile, Associate Professors--7th decile, Assistant Professors--9th decile, Instructors--7th decile. Clearly, the matter of salary levels must be reexamined and should be a major concern of the committee next year.

(2) Consideration of a number of matters regarding the Code and Ordinances was begun with the distribution to department chairmen of a questionnaire concerning appointment and promotion procedures. Forty-eight of sixty-two departments responded, revealing a marked absence of formalized procedures. Accordingly, the committee submitted to the Senate "A Resolution Concerning Procedures for Making Decisions Affecting Faculty Status," (Res. 69/12), which--in amended form--was passed. The committee determined that there were a number of questions regarding the Code and Ordinances that needed careful consideration but that further deliberation would have to be postponed until the next term.

(3) The committee carefully investigated a number of matters relating to the tuition waiver benefit for faculty children, including the number of faculty children eligible (recently, presently, and in the near future), extent of utilization of the present benefit during recent years, and probable costs and benefits of various alternative plans. Determining that providing an alternative to the present benefit of a direct payment to other institutions of tuition costs up to half the then prevailing rate at The George Washington University was both desirable and practical, the committee submitted to the Senate "A Resolution Concerning Tuition Benefits for Faculty Children" (Res. 69/13). The Resolution as amended by the Senate was passed unanimously.

The Chairman wishes to thank Miss Ellison Royce for her services to the committee and Director of the Budget W. D. Johnson for his helpful cooperation.

John A. Morgan, Jr., Chairman

The Committee
John G. Boswell
Burton S. Epstein
Michael Gallagher
Robert W. Kenny
John A. Morgan, Jr.
Benjamin Nimer
Loretta M. Stallings
Richard D. Walk

Harold F. Bright,
Vice President for Academic Affairs, ex officio

May 8, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

ANNUAL REPORT: EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE, 1969-70

1. The Educational Policy Committee has consistently maintained and developed the position, over a period of some years, that communication of objectives and the rationales for academic policies is a matter of critical concern to this institution. That this should be the case is the result of a number of factors. First, it must be admitted that a tradition of defining and reviewing of objectives and policies has not been adequately nurtured. Second, to a large extent those policies and objectives which have been explicated have resulted in the large from administrative action and been promulgated by a "that's it" directive, so that well-defined rationales acceptable to the academic community as a whole seldom were sought or developed. Third, the academic personnel, and the faculty in particular, have rather naturally taken somewhat of a "so-what" attitude toward this general question, placed as they have been in a position of relative impotence. Finally, to the extent that efforts have been made to make such studies and evaluations, their content is not usually of common knowledge since little impetus exists to study and evaluate material of negligible impact.

In response to this need, the Educational Policy Committee has promoted two resolutions passed by the Senate. In the Spring of 1969 the Senate accepted the recommendation of this Committee that an "Academic Forum" be established to promote discussions of topics of academic concern in the institution. "The Forum" has had some difficulties, not surprisingly, in its initial efforts but the Committee is heartened by the quality of the initial results. It does seem that a more reasonable expectation for publication frequency of three to four issues a year should be anticipated. In its current term the Senate found reason to accept this Committee's recommendation that the schools and divisions formally create and circulate, by inclusion in the Student Handbook or equivalent, suitable definitions and explanations of the objectives and policies of the academic program in the school. We feel a serious effort should be made to induce the schools to refine and review these presentations on an ongoing basis and hope the Senate Committee on University Objectives will join this Committee in this concern.

2. In the Spring of 1969 the Educational Policy Committee saw fit, unanimously, to recommend to the Senate that a School of Fine Arts, as an administrative entity, be created. The Senate referred this resolution to the Committee on University Resources who reported in the fall term that they were unable to support it since the funds required (about $70,000 per year) were not in hand and they were unable to place the need for such action in a primary position budgetarily. This report in no way disputed the extensive and valid arguments on academic grounds upon which this committee based its recommendation, but relied wholly upon the budgetary pressures which it felt existed. While the Educational Policy Committee had been well aware of these budgetary questions in making its recommendation and in no way accepted the position of the Committee on Resources, it chose not to dispute the issue as an isolated one at this time since it feels that it typifies the budgetary debility of the institution insofar as meaningful academic planning is concerned. We have therefore chosen to retain the question of the School of Fine Arts as an object point in the broader context of our deep concern with budgetary procedures in general.

3. For the last several years the matter of greatest concern to the Committee on Educational Policy has been that of rational budgetary procedures in the institution. This is a particularly crucial point in time in this regard for a number of reasons: first, institutions of higher learning in general are in a period of relative budgetary construction; second, these institutions are experiencing a period of extraordinary demands budgetarily due to pressures for revisions of their historic role in society; third, this institution has undertaken a planned-programmed budgeting evaluation with a view to major revisions in its procedures; fourth, increased faculty involvement in the definition of objectives and policies has created pressures to establish conditions budgetarily to make such involvement tangibly significant.

Academically, this institution is administered through the budget. That is the simple fact of the matter. Which programs will be established or die out, which departments will increase staff or suffer cutbacks, in sum, what the institution is and will become is fixed by budgetary constraints. And the input of the academic community as a whole into this crucial decision process is essentially nonexistent. The administrative budget committee tells the Dean what he will receive budgetarily, he, often on a purely personal, informal basis, tells the departments what they will get. Such is the budgetary procedure. It is the conviction of the Educational Policy Committee that this is just not good enough.

In the recent past the Budget Committee has in large followed a simple "incrementing" pattern in its allocations - everybody gets a fixed percent more than last time, dependent on income. This is a simple way of avoiding all evaluation of objectives and goals and the decisions required to effect these. No mechanism exists by which such decisions could be rationally attained, so the administrator can easily say he doesn't know how to improve on the procedure. In this chaotic time it is remarkable that we have chosen a system which is capable of bringing about a reevaluation of objectives only as an emergency response.

At the Deans' level the situation is more variable, but in interviews with Deans, departmental chairmen and others it was clearly the case that a general circumstance at the operational level was an incredible lack of "grasp" of the program and policies being pursued accompanied by uncertainty concerning future directions intended. This tends to produce a highly defensive attitude at the departmental level and a minimum of academic vitality. In fact, a clearly discernible departmental attitude of "we don't fight too hard for what we think should be done for fear of budgetary reprisal" exists in many sections of the institution. Academic personnel, protected neither by established procedures of program evaluation and review nor by well-established guidelines of objectives and implementary policies tend to think first of protecting their interests and view all changes with suspicion.

The study program in the office of the Director of the Budget with respect to establishing a programmed budgeting system might serve to answer some of the problems which exist. Surely, a central difficulty is a widespread lack of facts concerning costs, relative costliness and trends, and a basic aspect of programmed budget system is an expanded and organized budgetary analysis on an ongoing basis. This is sorely needed. However, the Educational Policy Committee must assert that, as a comprehensive budgetary procedure, the program as now envisaged seems highly unsophisticated; it may, if not critically developed, represent an outright danger to the development

of valid and meaningful procedures for establishing objectives and policies of academic validity. As it now exists, the system seems capable of making decisions based on little but a cost-income basis and, since it involves a great centralization of the decision-making process without compensating inputs from the academic sector of the institution, could represent the final destructive element in the decline of academic vitality in the institution. As Harry Williams states, in a report to the American Council on Education concerning programmed budgeting:

> On the one hand, any substantive concern with the logic of decision making in an existing organization will always tend to generate defensive attitudes at the operating levels. On the other hand, at higher levels such proposals may be received with too much enthusiasm. This may be particularly true in an entity as complex as a university, where many university administrators are quite enthusiastic about proposals that appear to simplify their tasks. Although this attitude is not peculiar to university administrators, they are particularly susceptible to it because almost all university administrations are operated at austere levels of funding and manpower.

In other words, there is the risk that such a program will be embraced by an harassed administration as a "cop-out" from making difficult and intricate objectives and policies decisions, these being replaced by simplistic cost-income decisions. This is not the intent of a properly understood programmed budget system, which is intended to assist in making and implementing the vital policy decisions which shape the destiny of the institution - not replace these decisions.

As Mr. Williams further says:

> It is important to remember that a program budget system should be a dynamic structure within which all the decision units are able to review continuously the effectiveness with which their portion of the university's overall goals and objectives is being implemented. If all the budgetary units are to reexamine continuously alternative means of achieving their goals, they must not be so suppressed that their study of alternatives becomes meaningless.

A programmed budget system should not be thought of as simplifying budgetary decision processes; it should be thought of as enriching and making more potent such processes. To do so it requires adequate support staff and adequate objectives and policies specifications. Since neither of these seem to be a matter of concern to the developing program, the Educational Policy Committee can only view the situation with apprehension.

The Educational Policy Committee feels that the faculty must continue to acquaint itself with the developing budgetary situation and must exert pressure to ensure that procedures are established to assure the academic validity of the budgetary process. For, indeed, it is here that the character of the institution will be determined.

A. J. Zuchelli

A. J. Zuchelli, Chairman

The Committee
James S. Aven
John W. Brewer
Astere E. Claeyssens
J. Reid Hambrick
Robert S. Jordan
Hewitt Kenyon
James C. King
W. A. MacDonald
Theodore P. Perros
William E. Schmidt
Carl Steiner
Charles S. Tidball
Helen B. Yakobson
A. J. Zuchelli
Lloyd H. Elliott, President, ex officio
Harold F. Bright, Vice President for Academic Affairs, ex officio

May 8, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1969-70
FACULTY PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Committee considered the following topics and recommends the actions as noted.

1. Persistent criticism has been expressed concerning a very small number of faculty members who fail to carry on their academic duties in a responsible fashion. In order to bring to light those who fail to do so, a number of questions were added to the Academic Evaluation questionnaires which were designed to achieve this objective. Examples of unacceptable behavior are a failure to meet classes on a regular basis, habitual tardiness in meeting classes, delegation of lecturing to students and similar activities.

 It is hoped that this procedure will eliminate these practices.

2. There are always a small number of faculty members who fail to return semester grades to the Registrar by the stated deadline. Some leave town and literally disappear without any word left behind as to how they may be reached. Failure to submit semester grades without cause is a serious offense and must be treated as such. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Registrar notify the Provost and Departmental Chairmen of those faculty members who fail to submit grades by the final deadline. It will be the responsibility of the Departmental Chairman to ascertain the reason for the failure to submit grades and to report to the Provost his findings. In the event of negligence a warning should be given. If a second offense occurs without extenuating circumstances, the Provost should initiate disciplinary measures in accordance with the procedures which are now in existence.

3. In order to honor excellence in teaching, it is recommended that The George Washington University establish an award to be given each year to the faculty member adjudged to have made the most distinctive contribution to the development and enrichment of undergraduate education in its broadest sense. The award shall take the form of an appropriately designed plaque.

 A faculty committee shall be appointed in confidence by the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University to select the recipient of the award. On call, nominations shall be submitted by any member of the university community to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

 The following guidelines are suggested as a basis for the selection of the recipient of the award:

 (1) The candidate shall have completed five years of full-time service in teaching at The George Washington University.

 (2) Preference shall be given to those who teach in Columbian College.

(3) A candidate should have demonstrated to a high degree:

(a) an ability to motivate students to undertake independent study.

(b) the capacity to generate scholarly interest and enthusiasm for the subject matter of his course.

(c) the ability to present a subject as an entity, i.e., to demonstrate synthesis as well as analysis.

(d) a sincere concern for improving student-faculty consultation.

4. Many faculty members are unaware of the Faculty Fellowship Information Center which is located in the Graduate School and which is under the supervision of Miss Darlene Roth. The Committee desires to bring this operation to the attention of the faculty.

Theodore Perros

Theodore Perros, Chairman

The Committee
Raymond S. Cottrell
Thomas F. Courtless
Charles R. Naeser
Theodore P. Perros
Melvin Reich
Klaus Thoenelt
Edwin Timbers

Harold F. Bright, ex officio

May 8, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

University Senate Committee on Physical Facilities
Annual Report, 1969-70

The committee has been concerned with the priorities, locations, and the architectural plans for the buildings to be constructed on the campus.

At the beginning of this academic year, Marcou, O'Leary and Associates, Planning and Urban Development Consultants, were appointed by the University to update and revise the University Long Range Campus Development Plan to meet the requirements of the Zoning Regulations of the District of Columbia and the National Planning Commission. At the committee's request to Vice President Herzog, a presentation was made by Marcou, O'Leary and Associates on March 26, 1970 to the committee. At the suggestion of the committee, a similar presentation will be made to the Senate at its May 8, 1970 meeting. This committee agrees with the recommended locations by Marcou, O'Leary and Associates for the Medical School, the Library and garage, and the overall concept of the campus development plan.

The committee makes the following recommendations:

a) According to resolution 68/6, the incoming Senate Committee on Physical Facilities should participate, as soon as possible, in the choice of architectural plans for the Medical School, the Library, and the garage.

b) It is brought to the committee's attention by the University curator that there exists a pressing need for an appropriate storage space with proper temperature and humidity control for the University's valuable art collection. We recommend that such a space be provided as soon as possible by the Physical Facilities Committee of the University.

Galip M. Arkilic
Chairman

The Committee

Hugh Y. Bernard
Lloyd S. Bowling
Stephen Korcheck
R. L. Weintraub
David G. White
Henry W. Herzog, VP & Treasurer, ex officio
Martin M. Roudabush, Plant Engineer, ex officio
J. C. Einbinder, Business Mgr., ex officio

May 6, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1969-70 - SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

The University Senate Committee on Research has had referred to it only one major item during the current academic year. The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the University Senate asked the University Senate Committee on Research to review the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research. This report was approved by the Committee as representing a worthwhile approach to the policy of the University with the recommendation that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research be adopted at the earliest possible opportunity.

This has since been accomplished and the University Committee on Sponsored Research has been established. Two members of the University Senate Committee on Research were among people nominated to the University Committee on Sponsored Research and both are serving.

At a recent meeting of the Committee, the question of the presence of four committees within the University structure dealing with research in the University was introduced and discussed. The question was raised as to how the University Senate Committee on Research dealt with the activities with the other Committees and what the function of the University Senate Committee on Research should be. It was also questioned as to whether a necessity existed for the continuation of the University Senate Committee on Research in the presence of these other bodies, and whether these committees involved could not be combined into perhaps fewer committees than currently exist with the resulted streamlining of University function, and elimination of some duplication in activities. Since this meeting was not attended by a full representation of the Committee, no further action could be taken on this matter. Therefore, it will represent the major activity of the Committee during the next academic year.

Norman C. Kramer, M. D., Chairman
for the Committee

The Committee
Elyce Z. Ferster
N. T. Grisamore
Herman H. Hobbs
Norman C. Kramer
Kurt L. London
Anthony J. Mastro
J. W. Robb
Ira R. Telford

Harold F. Bright, ex officio
Arthur E. Burns, ex officio
Louis H. Mayo, ex officio
Benjamin D. Van Evera, ex officio

May 8, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1969-70 - SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIPS

In addition to matters already reported to the Senate, the Committee on Scholarships met on March 20, 1970, and among other matters considered the following recommendations were made unanimously:

1. Senate Committee Name

 Because the Senate Committee on Scholarships oversees the activities of the Office of Student Financial Aid which administers a broad range of financial aid programs in addition to scholarships, the name of the University Senate Committee on Scholarships should be changed to Senate Committee on Scholarships and Financial Aid.

2. Financial Aid Office Records Policy

 For the present time and time to come unless a subsequent University policy is established, information concerning a student and his family, which is contained in an application for financial aid, Parents' Confidential Statement, correspondence and other supporting documents, and personal knowledge of students and their families by Financial Aid Committee members and office staff should be used solely for the purpose of determining eligibility of applicants for financial aid awards.

 Such personal knowledge and documents should be revealed only to those outside the Financial Aid Committee or office staff who bear proper subpoena calling for such disclosure or written consent of parents and student.

Robert C. Vincent

Robert C. Vincent, Acting Chairman

The Committee
Harry G. Detwiler
Raymond R. Fox
Phillip Grub
Frank N. Miller
Sonya Quitslund
Charles E. Rice
J. R. Roman
Chung-Wen Shih
William L. Turner
Robert C. Vincent
Maurice K. Heartfield, ex officio
Paul Sherburne, ex officio
George W. G. Stoner, ex officio
William G. Williams, ex officio

May 8, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES COMMITTEE
Annual Report 1969-70

The following two reports constitute the report of the University Resources Committee for the academic year 1969-70.

October 9, 1969:

Report of the Resources Committee on Resolution 68/18, "A Resolution to Establish a School of Fine Arts" (appended to the University Senate Minutes of October 10, 1969, and part of the permanent record of the Senate)

April 10, 1970:

The University Resources Committee fully supports "A Resolution to Maintain Trustee Scholarships (69/11)." In recognition of the clear financial limitations within which the University operates, the Resources Committee accepts an obligation to assist the administration in establishing priorities for student financial aid and related matters.

Reuben E. Wood

Reuben E. Wood, Chairman

The Committee
Gilbert J. Ginsburg
Howard M. Sachar
Frederic R. Siegel
Karl E. Stromsem
R. H. Walker
Reuben E. Wood

Seymour Alpert, Vice President for Development, ex officio
Carl H. Walther, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, ex officio

May 8, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

1969-70 ANNUAL REPORT
SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The purpose of this committee was established on May 10, 1968: to "study the University's commitment to the community in which it is located; define goals and priorities; develop and recommend policies and programs to accomplish its goals."

Liaison was maintained with the Educational Opportunity Program which was partly an outgrowth of this committee's 1968-69 effort. Statistics on black student applications, acceptances, and registrations for prominent Eastern universities were obtained and compared to GWU as information on relative performance in this urban-related effort.

The committee introduced a Senate resolution for faculty-student-administrator groups to study curricula and their effectiveness in relating concerned students to urgent national (urban) problems. After debate and additional committee action, resolution 69/8 calling for publicity to academic curricula (and the rationale on which they are based) was passed.

The committee studied an extensive report by Harvard University on "the University and the City" and an American University proposal for curriculum development as related to urban problems. Discussions and comparisons to GWU were carried out.

Employment practices for non-academic personnel were reviewed from the standpoint of safeguards against discrimination and were found to be in good order. Similar investigation of the equal employment opportunity practices of the University with regard to contracts for construction of facilities showed rigorous steps to achieve equal opportunities for all.

Ideas and activities for the "Washington GWU Project" were solicited by committee members through the prospectus for the Project.

Presson S. Shane, Chairman

The Committee
Sherwin Greene
Joseph Intermaggio
Robert G. Jones
Patricia M. Lengermann
Joseph B. Levy
Dorn C. McGrath
Malcolm L. Meltzer
Clarence C. Mondale
R. C. Nash
Presson S. Shane
Lowell Smith
Richard W. Stephens
Harold Stevens
Louis H. Mayo, ex officio

May 8, 1970

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 1969-70

The Executive Committee calls attention to the attached tabulation of actions on resolutions throughout the 1969-70 session. The tabulation summarizes the major accomplishments of the year.

The Committee has acted on behalf of the Senate in emergency situations which developed in the Spring of 1969, and to a lesser extent in the academic year 1969-70.

The Committee has acted as mediator in a number of nonconcurrence cases which were settled before they reached the Senate. The Committee expresses its thanks to Professor Reuben E. Wood for his counsel and service in several such cases.

The Committee has served as an advisory body to the President of the University upon request.

The Committee has two recommendations for study and possible action in the 1970-71 session. The Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies will be asked to study the University salary and fringe benefits program with especial attention to clarifications in the new policy of the American Association of University Professors for institutions of higher learning. The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom will be asked to study the University Code and Ordinances and to review cases and experiences which have arisen in recent years.

Edwin L. Stevens

Edwin L. Stevens, Chairman

Executive Committee
Harry R. Page
Howard C. Pierpont
Martha N. Rashid
David J. Sharpe
Edwin L. Stevens

Lloyd H. Elliott, ex officio

May 8, 1970

RESOLUTIONS 1969-70 Session

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Passed	Action other than "Passed"
69/1	5/9/69	To accept the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Athletics pertaining to the NCAA Rule on Institutional Aid	5/9/69	--
69/2	5/9/69 (Special)	To enable the creation of a student court to hear breaches of the University peace	5/9/69	--
69/3	10/10/69	Attached to Annual Report of Committee on University Objectives, A Resolution defining University Objectives with particular respect to Sponsored Research and Community Service	Continued to 1970-71	To be placed on agenda of October Meeting. Continued to 1970-71 session by means of Annual Report of the Committee.
69/4	10/10/69	On Public Ceremonies	10/10/69	--
69/5	11/14/69	To Encourage School & Departmental Curriculum Studies	69/8 Substituted	Referred as amended to the Committee on Educational Policy for further study, the Committee to report back to the Senate by the end of the Fall Semester. Committee could not support 69/5 and reported out 69/8 as a substitute.
69/6	12/12/69	To establish a permanent joint committee of the University Senate and the Student Assembly	12/12/69	As Amended
69/7	2/13/70	A Resolution concerning Smoking in the Classroom	2/13/70	--
69/8	2/13/70	A Resolution concerning Rationales for Academic Programs, Curriculum Requirements and Supporting Activities	2/13/70	--
69/9	2/13/70	A Resolution to Approve the Joint Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities	2/27/70	With Amended Statement

RESOLUTIONS 1969-70 Session

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Passed	Action other than "Passed"
69/10	2/13/70	A Resolution to Investigate Procedures of Registration and Ancillary Problems	Passed 2/13/70 and.....	Referred to Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty for implementation
69/11	3/13/70	A Resolution to Maintain Trustee Scholarships	Passed 4/10/70	Referred 3/13/70 to University Resources Committee for study and recommendations; 4/10/70 reported out and adopted.
69/12	3/13/70	A Resolution concerning Procedures for making decisions affecting Faculty Status	3/13/70 Passed as amended	--
69/13	4/10/70	A Resolution Concerning Tuition Benefits for Faculty Children	4/10/70 Passed as amended	--
69/14	4/10/70	Resolution Concerning Annual Award for Contribution to Undergraduate Education	Tabled 4/10/70	--
69/15	4/10/70	Resolution Concerning Submission of Semester Grades by a Specified Deadline	Tabled 4/10/70	--
69/16	4/10/70	A Resolution to Affirm Intent to Proceed to Establish the Joint Committee of the University Senate and Student Assembly	Passed as amended 4/10/70	--
69/17	4/10/70	A Resolution Concerning the Establishment of a University Environmental/Ecological Program	Passed 4/10/70	--
69/18	4/10/70	A Resolution of Appreciation - John W. Brewer	Passed 4/10/70	--
69/19	4/10/70	A Resolution of Appreciation - Robert E. Cronin	Passed 4/10/70	--

RESOLUTIONS 1969-70 Session

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Passed	Action other than "Passed"
69/20	5/8/70	A Resolution to Extend Resolution 69/2 for One Semester	Passed as amended 5/8/70	
69/21	5/8/70	A Resolution to Amend the Bylaws so as to Continue Existing Standing Committees	Deferred	Deferred until Special Senate Meeting 5/22/70

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The University Senate

April 30, 1970

The University Senate will meet on Friday, May 8, 1970, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room on the sixth floor of the Library.

Agenda

1) Call to order

2) Minutes of the regular meeting of April 10, 1970

3) Special Business
 a) Presentation by Marcou, O'Leary & Associates - New Library Building
 b) Announcements by Chairman of the Executive Committee
 c) Nomination and Election of Chairmen and Members of Standing Committees

4) Report from Committee
 Report on Resolution 69/10 (Registration and Ancillary Problems) by the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty (addendum to Annual Report of April 2, 1970)

5) Introduction of Resolutions
 a) A RESOLUTION TO EXTEND RESOLUTION 69/2 FOR ONE SEMESTER (69/20)
 b) A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS SO AS TO CONTINUE EXISTING STANDING COMMITTEES (69/21)

6) General Business
 Annual Reports from the following Committees:
 Admissions and Advanced Standing
 Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
 Educational Policy
 Faculty Performance and Development
 Physical Facilities
 Research
 Scholarship
 University and Urban Affairs
 Executive Committee

7) Brief Statements

8) Adjournment

Frederick R. Houser
Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO EXTEND RESOLUTION 69/2 FOR ONE SEMESTER
(69/20)

Whereas the Student Court will expire unless extended by Senate action, and

Whereas the ad hoc Judicial Committee has not submitted its final recommendations for a permanent judicial system, and

Whereas the record of the past year provides insufficient experience on which to recommend the abolition or the permanent extension of the student court, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That Resolution 69/2 be extended through the Fall Semester 1970-71.

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS
SO AS TO CONTINUE EXISTING STANDING COMMITTEES (69/21)

Whereas (a) the Faculty Assembly on April 5, 1970, voted to amend the Faculty Organization Plan by striking out the list of Senate standing committees found in Article III, sec. 5(c)(3), leaving the Senate free to create its own structure of standing committees, but leaving a vacuum until the committees are restructured in Senate Bylaws, and

Whereas (b) that amendment can become effective only upon adoption by the Board of Trustees, and no sooner than the Board's next meeting May 21, 1970, and

Whereas (c) Senate standing committees need to be set up now, and will function until the amendment referred to is adopted by the Board, and thereafter will be needed until implementing Bylaws can be proposed, debated, and adopted by the Senate, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

1. The Senate standing committees as presently enumerated in the Faculty Organization Plan, Article III, sec. 5(c)(3), are hereby incorporated as a new Section 11 of the Senate Provisional Bylaws, as follows:

2. "Section 11. Standing Committees

There shall be standing committees for the following areas: Educational Policy; Faculty Performance and Development; University Objectives; Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty; Research; Admissions and Advanced Standing; Library; Public Ceremonies and Assemblies; Scholarship; Athletics; Student Relationships; Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies; Physical Facilities; and Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom."

3. Other standing committees created by the Senate shall continue in force.